

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                        | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/681,539                             | 10/08/2003     | Myung-suk Kim        | 400700              | 7479             |
| 27717 75                               | 590 08/18/2005 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| SEYFARTH SHAW<br>55 EAST MONROE STREET |                |                      | ALEXANDER, REGINALD |                  |
| SUITE 4200                             | NOE BIREE!     |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| CHICAGO, IL                            | 60603-5803     |                      | 1761                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/681,539   | KIM, MYUNG-SUK   |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  | Reginald L. Alexander  | 1761   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | <u> </u>   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period verailure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☒ This action is non-final.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |  |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  | •  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o   | r election requirement.  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine  | r.   |  |  |  |  |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 08 October 2003 is/are:   | a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected   | to by the Examiner.  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the  | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See  | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct   | ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj   | jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  | aminer. Note the attached Office   | Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign   | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)  | )-(d) or (f).  |  |  |  |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior   | •  | ed in this National Stage  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau  | , ,,,  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list   | of the certified copies not receive  | ed.  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview Summary   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> </ul>  | Paper No(s)/Mail Da  | ate<br>'atent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/03.   | 6) Other:  | atom application (F 10-104)  |  |  |  |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Ac  | tion Summary   | Part of Paper No./Mail Date 0805   |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 1761

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capelle et al. in view of Kim '290.

There is disclosed in Capelle a cooking utensil comprising: a main body 3 forming an interior for containing food; a stiffening plate 6 provided with a plurality of through holes 10; and a heat transfer plate 5 interposed between a bottom surface of the main body and the bottom surface of the stiffening plate, wherein the heat transfer plate and the main body are pressed against each other and then attached to each other so that the heat transfer plate is partially inserted into the through holes.

Kim discloses that it is known in the art to use a stiffening plate 40 which extends to the edge of a side surface of a main body 10, and provided with a plurality of through holes 41.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the stiffening plate of Capelle with that taught by Kim, in order to protect the entire bottom surface of the main body.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Huppi et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,539

Art Unit: 1761

Huppi teaches that it is known in the art to soften a heat transfer plate material 6 in order to apply it to a bottom surface of a main body.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the construction method of Capelle, as modified by Kim, with that taught by Huppi, in order to provide an alternative means of applying the heat transfer plate to the main body.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Kim '611.

Kim teaches that it is known in the art to use the claimed temperature and pressure ranges when constructing a multiple layered bottom to a cooking utensil.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to construct the vessel of Capelle, as modified by Kim, using the temperature and pressure ranges disclosed in Kim '611, in order to ensure the adhesion of the transfer plate and stiffening plate to the bottom of the utensil.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Cartossi and Coudurier et al. are cited for their disclosure of the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reginald L. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1395. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,539 Page 4

Art Unit: 1761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rla August 16, 2005 Reginald L. Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761